

REMARKS

The action by the Examiner of this application, together with the cited references, has been given careful consideration. Following such consideration, claims 1-5, 7-13 and 17-20 have been amended to define more clearly the patentable invention applicant believes is disclosed therein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action dated March 4, 2005 are respectfully requested.

In the present Office Action, claims 1-7, 9-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sumrack (US 5,338,248); claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumrack; claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; and claim 9 as well as the disclosure are objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended the claims and disclosure considering the Examiner's rejections and objections. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Rejections of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-20 have been appropriately amended to eliminate the confusion and duplication thereof. Hence, the rejections of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112 are overcome.

Objections of Claim 9 and Specification

Claim 9 has been amended to refer back to Claim 8, and “FIG. 5” in paragraph [0020] is amended as “FIG. 5A and 5B.” Thus, the objections of Claim 9 and the specification are overcome.

Rejections of Claims 1-7, 9-14 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Regarding Claims 1 and 13, the local exhaust system for VOC pollution control is provided. The system includes a plurality of hoods, pipelines and air flow regulators. It should be appreciated that the hoods receive and collect the VOC by means of air flows from outside of the opening of the hoods. In the main implementation of the present invention, this local exhaust system is preferably applied in a clean room, which usually has vertical air flows from the ceiling to the floor, and the opening is operative to face to the source of air flows, namely the ceiling. Thus, the system is *relatively passive* to receive and collect the polluted air flows with VOC, and air-extracting apparatus is merely applied to facilitate the exhaust of collected polluted air in the hoods and pipelines.

However, the apparatus disclosed in Sumrack must generate air flow by itself so as to collect the polluted air. The structure and operation of Sumrack are clearly different from those of the claimed invention. Hence, Sumrack fails to teach the hoods of the invention defined in Claims 1 and 13.

More importantly, the air flow regulators of the claimed system are capable of adjusting the flow rate of the polluted air through the pipeline, so as to control the uniformity of the air flow outside of the system. As seen, no component in the disclosure of Sumrack is provided with a similar structure and function. Consequently, Sumrack also fails to teach the air flow regulators in Claims 1 and 13.

In conclusion, Claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Sumrack and therefore patentable over the prior art. Since Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14 and 16-17 respectively depend on Claims 1 and 13, they should be patentable in view of the patentability of Claim 1.

Regarding Claims 3 and 16, the hoods disclosed in Sumrack cannot be combined to operate. Accordingly, Sumrack fails to teach the hoods in Claims 3 and 16, so Claims 3 and 16 are certainly patentable over prior art.

Regarding Claims 4 and 13, the container has an opening for receiving polluted air and an exhaust aperture for exhausting the collected polluted air. It should be appreciated that the opening and the aperture are positioned in the *opposite* surface of the container, but the openings 33A and 42 of Sumrack are positioned on the *adjacent* surfaces, as shown in FIG. 1 and 2. Thus, Sumrack fails to teach the container of Claims 4 and 13, so Claims 4 and 13 are certainly patentable over prior art.

Regarding Claims 6 and 14, the positioner placed between the hoods is applied to integrate the plural hoods and maintain them in fixed positions. However, Sumrack did not provide any element with similar structure and function, so Sumrack fails to teach Claims 6 and 14. Accordingly, Claims 6 and 14 are patentable over prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-7, 9-14 and 16-17 are not anticipated by the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The system defined in Claims 8 and 15 are applied to remove the VOC from the article by collecting the polluted air on the article. The hoods are placed around one side of the article, and the air flow coming from the other side of the article would carry the VOC from the surface of the article. With the structural characteristics defined in Claims 8 and 15, almost all of the polluted air would be collected in the hoods and directed away through the pipelines. Please refer to the table in paragraphs [0034] and [0035]. In these tables, the remarkable efficiency of the claimed invention is clearly presented.

However, the apparatus of Sumrack is not only unable reach such effect, but also inappropriate to be applied in the semiconductor process. Thus, the results of the invention defined in Claims 8 and 15 are *unexpected* to Sumrack. Claims 8 and 15 should be patentable over the prior art.

Besides, according to Claims 8 and 15, the article to be cleaned is a glass substrate, but the apparatus of Sumrack is merely applied to suck the evaporated fluid from the tank. From the drawings of Sumrack, it is apparent that the tank is not suitable to carry the glass substrate. Therefore, the present invention is totally different from the apparatus of Sumrack.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 and pass the present application to issuance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims in the present application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102, 103 and 112, and patentably define over the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 386998034US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

5/17/05

Respectfully submitted,

By

Chun M. Ng

Registration No.: 36,878

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant